



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

draw in practice between what you thus designate, if, indeed, there be the difference between them that you allege. Your "words of learned length and thundering sound," your *douleia*, *hyperdouleia*, and *latreia*, may make the ignorant believe that you are wonderfully learned, and that you are expressing some surprisingly big thing beyond the range of their understandings. But we Protestants require to know what you mean by these "sesquipedalia verba;" we want something more than having our ears amused by the jingle of sounds without signification. And we wish that Roman Catholics would anxiously inquire into the reality of the case, and look for something more substantial than unintelligible verbiage and the miserable jargon of the schools.

But, supposing that we are to be enlightened as to the reality of the distinction between *douleia*, *hyperdouleia*, and *latreia*, still the difficulty by no means ends here. These words, it will be understood, are used to designate the worship due to the saints and to the Virgin Mary and to God respectively. But what as to the relics? Is a relic of the Lord Jesus Christ—that is, what is said to have belonged to Him—to be honoured any more than a relic of the Virgin or one of the saints? Is there to be no more veneration given to a piece of the wood of the *true* (?) cross than to the Virgin's petticoat or to St. Christopher's tooth? If there is to be a distinction in the honour or worship of the individuals themselves, respectively, why not also of the relics that belonged to them? But, then, are all the relics of the same individual equally honourable? Is a piece of the Virgin's green petticoat to be venerated as much as a lock of her hair, or those tears that fell from her eyes, said by some unaccountable means to be still preserved? Are St. Peter's chains to receive no more worship than the piece of the stone on which the cock stood when he crew at his denial of his Master? Or is any relic connected with the "head of the Church" (?) of no more value than the holy tongs with which, reddened in the fire, St. Dunstan held the devil so fast by the nose that his howling was heard over all the neighbourhood? Are all relics to be equally honoured? Is there a distinction to be made as regards the persons to whom they belonged, or as regards their relation to those persons? These questions require consideration. They suggest real, practical difficulties; and, indeed, the whole matter, in a great measure, depends upon them. But supposing distinctions are to be pointed out, though the Roman Church has never yet done so, and probably never will, how are they to be observed in practice? How are such distinctions to be observed in each individual's case? By what scale are they to be regulated? No such scale has ever, up to the present moment, been provided, so that no Roman Catholic can be certified that he has been giving due honour to the saints or their relics, or that he has at all worshipped them aright, no matter what the worship may be which belongs to them.

Since, then, the Romish Church has left the matter undecided, it remains to each individual to decide on it for himself. But why leave it to each individual's decision? Is not that to leave the whole thing to men's private whims—we will not say private judgment; for there can be no proper "judgment" on such a subject; it must be determined by the feelings or the fancy, since there are no data on which to found a judgment. Now, "due" honour, whatever be its nature and extent, must be some definite amount of honour, and this cannot be added to or taken from without incurring guilt of some sort. If a number of men venerate a relic in different ways, each according to his own fancy or temperament, though they may be all wrong, they cannot be all right; for the "due" veneration is one fixed and determined kind and amount of veneration. It is not any kind or degree, but one particular kind which can be said to be thus "due." If, then, men are to render to the relics of saints this "due veneration," they ought, at least, to know what it is: the proper quality and quantity of it ought to be determinable by some known and authorized standard, or some competent and accessible tribunal; otherwise they must be left to guesswork and mere conjecture, or the unregulated impulse of imagination.

We maintain that, as the case stands, no Roman Catholic can assure his own conscience on just grounds that he has on any occasion given to relics, or to the saints themselves, that due quality and amount of honour which his Church requires; and for this reason, that he does not know what that required amount or quality is. And if so, with what face can he come to a Protestant and insist on his worshipping those saints and their relics. We Protestants act reasonably, when we demand an explanation of what the worship is which the Roman Church thinks herself authorized to exact of all men for her supposed relics. Assuredly, if there are degrees and varieties of religious worship, and if a particular kind or degree is required of us, we have a right, nay, a duty, to know what it is. In the case of a man valuing very much a memento of a departed friend, he will be guided by circumstances: by the respect he had for that friend on former occasions, by the warmth of his own affections, and by the services or connection of that friend to him. He is, of course, ruled by his own discretion in the matter. His affection, however, may be unwise, may be extravagant, or beyond what the state of things calls for; or else it may not be adequate to the obligations he is under to that friend and the reverence which he properly

owes to his memory. In either case, however, there is little involved; it is merely a question of private feeling, and may be decided wrongly or rightly without any particular bad results flowing from it. It may, then, without danger, be left, and, in fact, from the very nature of the thing, it must be left, to one's personal judgment or discretion. But in the case of a religious veneration of relics things are entirely different. If we err in this, the error may lead us to everlasting perdition; because, to give too much or an extravagant veneration to relics is to be guilty of idolatry, while to give too little, or less than the "due honour," is to fail in one's duty and be guilty of a sin of omission. Now, if there be any matters in which the guidance of an infallible Church is necessary, or about which she ought to enlighten the world, surely this is one of them. It is in things like this, that are difficult and delicate, that the aid of infallibility is most required. But, strange to say, this aid has never yet been offered by that Church which so loudly claims infallible and unerring wisdom. Men are still left to flounder on just the same as if there were no infallible Church at all; or, rather, it is the pretended infallible Church that has raised the very difficulties in question, but is not forthcoming to help men out of them. For our part, we think very little of an infallibility which is only said to exist—which is only a subject of wrangling and disputation, invented to give some idle theologues matter to speculate upon and quarrel about; or to be a sort of gag to stop the mouth of whoever dares to question the dicta of a priesthood, but which is never available for any practical purposes, or when men stand in need of its assistance. Like the oracles of olden times, this infallible Roman Church, this supreme arbiter of controversies, has shrouded her responses in the veil of enigma and ambiguity; that is, has endeavoured to hide ignorance and incapacity under the garb of mystery, and to conceal the untruthfulness and unsatisfactoriness of her dogmas by wide and unmeaning platitudes, the blusterings of boasted authority, and the thunders of damnation. In the case before us the unerring guide has just safely swamped her followers in a quagmire, and there left them to fumble and tumble about as they may, of course duly informing them all the while that she cannot lead them astray, but that they must help themselves in matters of that kind.

But though the Council of Trent does not tell us what or how much honour or worship is to be given to the saints, it, however, informs us, as though it were a certain motive or reason for venerating them, that the bodies of saints "were the living members of Christ and temple of the Holy Ghost, and are to be raised up to eternal life, and to be glorified." Dr. Butler, in his general catechism, assigns these as reasons why "Catholics" should "honour the relics of the saints." But the bodies of saints are said in Scriptures to be members of Christ, not after death, but during life; at all events, it cannot be denied that they are as much so previous to death as afterwards. We cannot see how the fact that they have decayed and gone to corruption can add to their value in any sense. A rotten bone dug up in some cemetery is not more valuable than when it belonged to the living, breathing individual. The worm and the grave cannot by any means that we can discover entitle the ashes of a saint to more veneration than might rightfully belong to them in their animated, organised state. Surely, we cannot conceive how the body of Paul or Peter is more worthy of veneration after death than it was previously. If there be any difference, we would imagine that the living, active body in which the immortal spirit is residing, and in which the Holy Ghost dwells, is more honourable than the lifeless, spiritless, and loathsome dust which ought to be buried out of sight. But would Peter or Paul sanction any veneration of his body while he was alive? Of this we may judge by what Peter did when he rejected the worship of Cornelius: that worthy soldier fell down at the Apostle's feet, but Peter said, "Stand up, I also am a man." And Cornelius did not worship Peter's coat, nor his hat, nor his shoes, nor yet his skull, nor his thigh bone, nor his finger nail—but himself. But it will be said, Cornelius gave too high a worship to Peter. No doubt he did. But does not this show the necessity there is for our knowing how much honour or worship is due to the saints, if they are to be worshipped. But who can say that Cornelius offered any higher kind of worship to Peter than Roman Catholics now give to saints and their so-called relics? The Apostle did not say, "You give me the worship of *latreia* or *hyperdouleia*, instead of simple *douleia*;" but he forbade in toto any worshipping of him: "Stand up," said he; "I also am a man." This is exactly what we Protestants say when a Roman Catholic requires of us to worship a saint or venerate his relics. "Stand up," say we, "this saint was 'a man'; worship God; 'thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.'" But the bodies of the saints are to be raised up at the last day and to be glorified. This is certainly true, but it can be no reason for worshipping what are said to be fragments of their bodies. For, in the first place, we know little or nothing of the nature and process of that

resurrection to come, or of the properties of that glorious body, which all the people of God shall receive at the last day and possess through eternity. We do not know what relation that body will bear to the earthly frame. For instance, we cannot say whether each particular part of this mortal will be incorporated into that immortal and incorruptible one. We know from Scripture that they will be the same in some sense, but we have no authority for supposing, and there are also many difficulties in the supposition, that there will be an identity of each atom and particle, if indeed there be such in a spiritual nature. If, then, we see what really formed a portion of the body of a saint, we cannot, with certainty, affirm that it will be raised up and glorified as part of the resurrection body of him to whom it once belonged, and, consequently, we have no right to venerate it on that ground. But then, again, this can afford no authority for worshipping other relics, as pieces of garments and such like things. Surely, these will not be raised up and glorified at the last day!!

But these reasons, and, in fact, all which may be alleged on behalf of the worship of relics, prove too much, if they prove anything at all. For, if the bodies that are temples of the Holy Ghost, and that are members of Christ, and that are to be raised up at the last day, are to be worshipped or venerated on that account, then they may be worshipped before death; yea, and a Christian man—a saint, may worship and venerate his own body: we say, that if the Romish arguments prove anything, they prove this. Let us take the case of St. Peter, or any other saint. While he was alive his body was a temple of the Holy Ghost, was a member of Christ, and was to be raised up at the last day in glory. St. Peter might say this of himself as truly as we can say it of him, or as truly as he could say it of any saints who died before him. Now, these reasons, and all others which a Romanist might assign for his worshipping the relics of Peter, equally apply in the case of Peter himself, and would equally authorize him in venerating his own body while he was alive, or even now his dust on earth, though he be himself in heaven. And the same may be said of any one else as well as Peter. If Peter would not worship his own body, there is no reason why we should worship it; at least, all the reasons that might be urged on behalf of our doing it apply as well to his doing it; for he had the same duties, the same responsibilities, and was under the same laws of God as ourselves. But what can be more preposterous than a man worshipping his own body; and still worse, the articles of his clothing? The idea is horrible!

In order to exhibit, as nearly as possible, a full view of the case, we shall proceed to examine the arguments which Romish divines draw from Scripture in justification of the worship of relics. We shall now take as our guide Dr. Delahogue, professor in the College of St. Patrick's, Maynooth, and doctor of the Sorbonne.

(For continuation see page 68.)

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters meant for publication should be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street, and the real name and address given, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

We earnestly request our correspondents, both Protestants and Roman Catholics, to limit the length of their communications, when possible, and not in any case to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN is registered for transmission beyond the United Kingdom.

## The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JUNE 17, 1858.

THE Rambler for last month has an article on the "Mission of the Laity," which, as laymen, we read with peculiar interest.

Its professed object is to correct an alleged mistake, into which, the writer states, that many well-meaning persons are wont to fall, with respect to the position and the duties of the laity in the (Roman) Catholic Church.

It is, no doubt, a very common Protestant idea, and, we believe, a very true one, that the Church of Rome presents her votaries with a system of dogmas which are to be implicitly believed, without inquiry or previous investigation, merely at her bidding, and on her authority, and that any one who questions that authority, or demands grounds for such belief, is committing mortal sin, and perilling his salvation.

This truth, exaggerated and caricatured according to the usual artifice of the publication in

a Conc. Trid. Sess. xxv.

b Page 41.

c Rom. xii. 4, 5. 1 Cor. vi. 15.

d Acts x. 26. Rev. xix. 10, xxi. 9.

e Matt. iv. 10.

question, the writer endeavours to refute in the article we refer to; and it is curious to observe in what manner he strives to establish that the Roman Catholic laity are in a state of intellectual freedom, and "not without a place in the vast Catholic system."

But first let us state, in the writer's own words, the alleged error he is combating:—

"According to a very common Protestant idea, the Catholic laity are the tools, the instruments, or the victims of an ambitious, grasping, and intriguing priesthood. They are forced blindly to follow wherever they are led. They have no intelligent place in the vast Catholic system. Unable to exercise any independent act of judgment, tamely submissive to the iron rule of authority, the laity of the Church, according to the prevalent Protestant notions, occupy within its pale a position almost strictly analogous to that of the scholars in a large public school. They sit at the feet of their masters with considerable fear, and with little affection; and if they hesitate to comply with the imperious demands of those who hold them in spiritual bondage, they are either compelled to an unwilling obedience by the terrors of conscience, or they are rudely repulsed from the communion of their brethren."—P. 289.

Now, though there is much practical truth in the foregoing paragraph, it is obviously an overstatement of the Protestant belief, and designedly overstated to make it the more easy to answer it. No enlightened Protestant ever supposed that the Roman Catholic laity were *on no subject* allowed any independence of action or judgment; on the contrary, we have ourselves repeatedly shown that the Church of Rome is ever ready, when she thinks it expedient, to tolerate any amount of latitudinarianism in her children, so long as they humbly submit themselves to the Church's authority in matters of faith and ecclesiastical discipline—that is, do not dare to think or inquire for themselves in matters of faith, or question her authority in matters of practice, but *act* as submissive sons of the Church, and profess to believe whatever her infallibility proposes.

The absoluteness of the authority claimed by the priesthood in the domain of faith and morals is fully admitted in the following passage, though the writer tries to reconcile the laity to their position by the usual assertion, that the Church is the most amiable and tender of mothers, lenient to laxity itself towards the faults of her erring but *submissive* children:—

"When the beauty of the Church is seen and appreciated, her authority no longer presents itself in the light of a stern, unbending, unsympathizing iron rule. If it be the most absolute of all authorities, admitting no contradiction within its own domain of faith and morals, it is (like all really great authority) gentle, forbearing, indulgent in the extreme. The very restraints that, for the sake of the faith, it imposes upon the intellect and the reason, in fact, secure for the mind a more ample field of inquiry, in which it can freely range with perfect security. It must be almost self-evident that the very absoluteness of the spiritual authority of the Church renders it necessarily the least imperious of all powers."

The same reasoning would, of course, show that the Emperor of Russia must be the least imperious of all rulers; for the very absoluteness of his authority must render him the most patient, indulgent, and benignant of monarchs. And so, doubtless, he is; if his loyal subjects will only submit in all things to his imperial will, without a remonstrance or a murmur.

Let us see, however, what proofs the *Rambler* gives of the amplexes of the field of inquiry open to laymen, and judge whether they are not all quite consistent with the absolute truth of everything which any enlightened Protestant has ever asserted of the subjection of the Roman Catholic laity to the priesthood.

It will be seen that the *advancement of the Church* and the *spiritual interests of humanity* are synonymous expressions, according to the view of the *Rambler*; and, of course, we will readily admit that the Church of Rome allows full power to every layman who is disposed to labour in the cause of the *Church* to exert him-

self to the utmost to increase *its* power and advance *its* interests in the world.

"It may not be uninteresting to notice some of the various ways in which Providence calls on the Catholic laity to labour for the *advancement of the Church* and the *salvation of souls*."

The writer commences with political life, and supposes the case of a Roman Catholic layman in the House of Commons, where he illustrates the freedom of his position by stating, that he is perfectly free to advocate the measure at present under discussion as to legitimizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister, and also the introduction of Jews into parliament, and does not disguise his views in favour of both measures, and that "the admission of Jews into parliament is rightly upheld by the Catholic members." He is not free, however, to advocate such measures as the Divorce Bill, because "it contradicts the dogmas of our faith."

"So long as a Catholic politician does not truckle to mere power, so long as he is faithful to the Church, and admitted to be such, he may follow with advantage whatever political course he thinks best."

"Our model politician would take an active interest in everything relating to the social and political good of the nation, while he would avoid the reputation of being a mere religious partizan! At the same time, he would be true to the cause of the Church, watchful over her interests, prompt to rise in her vindication whenever she was assailed, bold in pressing her political and civil claims upon public attention, &c. Such a man is called to a vast, and powerful, and most important mission; and he will not have lived or laboured in vain if he execute it with fidelity to the sacred principles of his holy religion."

Such is the ample field open to politicians, so long as they are "faithful to the Church," and *admitted to be such*, i.e., admitted by the priesthood to be such; in other words, so long as they tamely submit to their authority, and promote their ends, by pressing their political and civil claims upon public attention. Let us see now what liberty a Roman Catholic layman possesses in another capacity—viz., that of Catholic landlord and proprietor.

"He may provide efficient schools and suitable churches," "become a country magistrate, a poor-law guardian, a subscriber to the hospitals, &c. He may repress petty acts of tyranny which are perpetrated on the (Roman) Catholic poor. He can secure justice for the aged poor in the union workhouse. He can watch over the Catholic children in these workhouses, and prevent, to a certain extent, the wholesale proselytism that so universally disgraces them. He can repress the same proselytism in the hospitals and other public charities, of which his position renders him a supporter; and in these, as well as in many other ways besides, he can fulfil a mission of considerable dignity, and of lasting benefit to his fellow-creatures."

Well, all these duties are very proper and respectable, no doubt; and supposing the tyrannical and disgraceful system complained of to really exist, it would be very proper for a country magistrate or poor-law guardian, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, to repress it by every influence in his power. But what all this has to do with the matter in question we are utterly at a loss to imagine. No one ever doubted that the Roman Catholic laity were perfectly free to do anything which the priesthood thought calculated to foster and advance the cause of their Church; but what Protestants do say is, that the priesthood deny the right of the laity to think or act for themselves, and represent all inquiry into the truth and propriety of any of the dogmas or practices of the Church as sin. And we do not see, through the whole of the article in the *Rambler*, one word tending to disprove the common Protestant idea, that the Roman Catholic laity, as far as they are real and consistent Romanists, are the tools, instruments, and victims of an ambitious and intriguing priesthood, or that the Roman Catholic Church is the most absolute of all authorities, admitting no contradiction to her iron rule.

In England, possibly, it may be deemed as yet politic to conceal under the mask of mildness

and benignity the characteristics of a Church which is at present struggling to regain, but has not yet regained, its supremacy; but in Ireland the iron rule of the priesthood is well understood by those classes who are alone subject to their sway; and to call it "the least exacting and least interfering of all authorities" is simply ludicrous to any who have had the slightest opportunities of witnessing its exercise. In Ireland, at least, the "Mission of the Laity" is implicit obedience and unquestioning faith, and anything more exacting or interfering, socially, politically, or spiritually, could scarcely be found in any part of Christendom.

It is so much the fashion in the present day, among certain circles, to magnify the importance of the secessions from the Church of England to Rome, and the tendencies of the so-called Tractarian movement, that we think it cheering to find at the close of this article, when speaking on the subject of Roman Catholic literature, some unequivocal passages showing that the writer considers the heart of England still essentially Protestant, and not at all likely to read Roman Catholic literature, at least unless it improves very much upon the present standard. A thoroughly good article, no doubt, is sure to sell, and we agree with the writer that Catholic literature will obtain a fair position amid the literature of the country, *when it deserves it!* That it does not deserve it as matters stand at present, the *Rambler* being judge, is utterly undeniable.

"If we desire to make a lasting impression on the public mind we must labour to get access to it through the instrumentality of good and useful books. The English are a reading people. Reading is quite an English passion. Every house has its library, and every young boy and girl have their shelves of books. Thus literature is evidently a most important channel for good or evil; and to underrate its value, to discourage its pursuit, to be indifferent to its success, argues either ignorance of the actual habits of the nation, or a serious want of practical discernment. It is very true that the literature of England is essentially Protestant, and essentially anti-Catholic. It is also true that the mass of the people do not at present and will not read Catholic books. Any attempt, therefore, at the formation of a Catholic literature must, in its own nature, be an up-hill and arduous task. It will have to contend with great difficulties; but these are by no means insuperable. Already the ice is beginning to thaw, and it may not be very long before a greater revolution is effected in these matters than we can at present anticipate. [It was, of course, necessary for our friend not to represent the case as absolutely hopeless.] For ourselves, we have a strong belief in the principle that a *thoroughly good article is sure to sell*. A really able paper is certain to succeed; and although it may be slow in getting into circulation, this is only a temporary inconvenience. Catholic literature, therefore, will work its way through every difficulty, if it really deserve to succeed. Without doubt, a weak, timid, fawning, sycophantic literature will ever crawl along the ground, until it bury itself in some congenial mire; but, then, the reason is, not because it is Catholic, but because it is contemptible. Its vulgarity, its toadyism is to blame, not the correctness of its principles. Of course, until booksellers, and reviewers, and newspaper conductors see this there is no chance for a Catholic literature. But there are symptoms at present that people are beginning to open their eyes to this very common truth. What we want is, to get a hearing in the country, and to take a worthy place in the field of its literature. There are great odds against us. Arrayed against us is the prestige of the national Protestantism. We cannot flatter the popular prejudices or the popular vanity by the reproduction of oft-refuted lies. We must, on many subjects, say unpopular things. We are *antagonistic, necessarily, to the national mind*. These are obstacles in our way which neither time nor talent will easily remove. But in spite of them all, Catholic literature will obtain a fair position amid the literature of the country, when it deserves it. A really good book will be read; an able review will succeed. If pains be taken, and capital expended, and a high literary standard sustained, a proportionate success will attend such labours. If we fail, it will be because we deserve to fail; if we succeed, it will be because we have merited success."

We also are quite sure that Protestants will appreciate a real good literature, whether it be written by Roman Catholics or Protestants; but that Protestant England, in its excessive liberality, may never give *more success* than it deserves to a literature whose express object is to

deprive her of her Protestantism, and reduce the national mind of her people to "the most absolute of all authorities, admitting no contradiction within its own domain of faith and morals," is our most earnest desire, as our experience has not been exactly what is represented by the writer we have been quoting, that the Church of Rome is a "gentle, forbearing, and indulgent" mother, "the least exacting and interfering of all authorities!"

### WORSHIP OF RELICS.

(Continued from page 66.)

#### DR. DELAHOGUE'S ARGUMENTS FROM SCRIPTURE.

In endeavouring to prove that the "cultus" of relics is "good and useful," he says, "It is proved; first from the Scripture, in which are many things to show that this worship is lawful and useful.

1st. (Exod. 13) When Moses departed from Egypt, he took with him the bones of Joseph, in accordance with what that patriarch had commanded his brethren (Gen. 49). And Eccles. 49 it is said, 'His bones were visited, and after death they prophesied.'

2nd. (Kings 4, 13) It is said, 'Some who were burying a man saw the robbers, and they cast the corpse into the sepulchre of Eliseus, which, when it touched the bones of Eliseus, the man revived and stood upon his feet;' and in like manner (Eccles. 48) the dead body of Eliseus is said to have prophesied. These, surely, are very fit to establish the veneration which ought to be paid to the bones of saints."

Before we proceed farther, we must consider these passages of the sacred Scriptures, and inquire as to whether they warrant the conclusion which the learned doctor draws from them. First, then, as to the bones of Joseph. When Joseph was dying he took, we are told, an oath of his brethren that when God would visit them, they would carry up his bones out of the land of Egypt. St. Paul says, "By faith Joseph, when he was dying, made mention of (*ἐμνημόνευσε*, i.e., called to remembrance) the departure of the children of Israel, and gave commandment concerning his bones."<sup>1</sup> It was by making mention of, or called to remembrance, the promise of God, that He would bring up the descendants of Jacob into the land that He had promised to their fathers<sup>2</sup> that the dying Joseph showed his faith. The oath which he took of his brethren was the means by which he expressed the certainty of this faith, and it was in discharging the obligation of that oath that Moses carried up the good man's bones into that land of promise, into which he had believed that God would bring his people. We are not told in Scripture of any miracle that was wrought by means of these bones; still less are we informed of any worship that was given to them. It was not to have them worshipped that Moses carried them up into the land of Canaan, nor was it for any such purpose that the holy man on his death-bed took the solemn oath of his brethren. The oath was taken, and the bones were carried up for a totally different object; and we do not read a word in the whole Bible of these bones being preserved as relics, or exposed for the veneration of the faithful; or of any one ever worshipping them. But, on the contrary, we do read that under the government of Joshua they were buried in Shechem.<sup>3</sup> And this is, we think, what ought to be done with the bones and dust now unfortunately worshipped by Romanists. The passage in the book of Ecclesiasticus says nothing of any worshipping of these bones, and no way sanctions it; but as this book is Apocryphal, and no part of inspired Scripture, we do not think it necessary to enter upon any explanation of it.

Then, as to the case of Eliseus or Elisha, the same observation may be made—namely, that it is not said that any religious worship or veneration was offered to his bones. Now, these passages of Holy Scripture, so far from sanctioning or "establishing the veneration of relics," as Dr. Delahogue says, rather afford an invincible argument against such worship. For we have the bones of saints spoken of, we have a miracle recorded to have been wrought by means of them in one instance, and yet, not a word about worshipping them. Surely, if they were to be venerated, these would be the fit places to refer to it, to enjoin it, or, at least, relate the fact of worship having been offered to them. But since the Holy Ghost makes no allusion to any worshipping of these bones, and gives no sanction to doing so, we are warranted in the conclusion that it is not a thing He would have us learn,<sup>4</sup> and that it is a thing alien from the mind of the Spirit, seeing it is unauthorized by the word of God, and especially in those passages where, if anywhere, we might expect an approval of it. But assuming that it was right to worship the bones of Joseph and those of Elisha; we ask, were they worshipped? The Scriptures do not inform us that they were: if, however, they were,

then it would be recorded, because it would be an example worthy of our imitation, and worthy of being "written for our learning;" but if they were not worshipped, as the probability is, then there would be a condemnation of the neglect, that ages to come might be warned lest they should fall into the evil custom of refusing to venerate the remains of the saints. In either case, therefore, whether they are worshipped or not, if it were right to do so it would be taken notice of and related, for our warning or instruction. But since there is no allusion to it, we may legitimately conclude that it is either a thing wrong, or at least of no importance. Thus viewed in every direction, the passages quoted from Scripture by Dr. Delahogue do not at all show that the worship of relics is good or useful, nor, indeed, do they give any countenance to such a worship.

The Professor goes on to say that "40 commend other relics avails much. 1. What was done by Eliseus, who used the mantle of Elias to divide the waters of the Jordan (4 Kings, 2). 2. What good things are recorded to have been done by the hands of Paul (Acts 19), so that 'upon the sick were brought handkerchiefs and aprons, and evil spirits went out.' 3. That splendid miracle in which, by the shadow of Peter passing by, the infirm were delivered from their infirmities (Acts 5), &c."

These are all the arguments drawn from Holy Scripture to warrant the worship of relics. They may be briefly considered thus: Elisha divided the waters of Jordan with the mantle of Elijah: true, but was that mantle, therefore, worshipped? This is the real question at issue. The miracle was unquestionably wrought; nobody denies that; nobody questions God's power to work a miracle by any instrumentality that seems fit to Him; but we do deny that it is right for us to worship the instrument so employed. The same remark applies to the case of the handkerchiefs and aprons brought from Paul's person. For, though miracles were wrought by means of them, yet we are not told in Scripture that they were worshipped, or that it is right to worship them. As to the shadow of Peter, why, then, among all the droll relics with which the Church of Rome has blessed the world, has she not preserved it in some corner or other for the edification of the faithful? It would be as admirable a relic as any, as wonder-working as any, and the veneration of it would be about as reasonable as of any of the others. But it may fairly be questioned whether any one in the Apostle's days worshipped his shadow. We suppose they hardly carried their devotion so far in those times.

But what do the passages of the sacred Scriptures quoted by Dr. Delahogue really prove? They prove that God was pleased to make use of certain things belonging to, or connected with, holy men as external signs—one cannot well say means—in the performance of miracles. But they do not show that these signs or means may be lawfully worshipped; much less do they show that the so-called relics put forth by the Church of Rome are to be worshipped. The shadow of Peter and the handkerchiefs and aprons brought from Paul's person cannot be called relics; for the persons to whom they belonged were alive at the time spoken of, and a relic is properly a thing left by a person who is dead. This, however, is of little importance; the real question to be determined being whether such things are to receive religious service. But there is no Scriptural authority for saying that those handkerchiefs, &c., were worshipped, although they were actually used in miraculous agency; nor is there any Scriptural authority for saying that, even if they were thus worshipped, it was right to do so, and, *a fortiori*, there is no Scriptural authority for worshipping Romish relics of which we have no just grounds for believing that any one of them was ever employed by God in working a miracle. For, as reasonable men, we are not to be deluded by the vain "old wives' fables" about the wonders said to be wrought by these miraculous relics, nor do we believe these stories to be worthy of the least credit—most of them are so ridiculous as not to deserve a moment's consideration. Even Dr. Butler, in his General Catechism, so extensively used among the Roman Catholics of Ireland, says that "images and relics of the saints have neither life nor sense nor power to hear or help us." And, indeed, there is scarcely a greater truth in the whole of that book.

But let us go a little farther into the subject, and inquire whether, even if relics were made use of by God in the performance of miracles, this would authorize our offering religious worship to them. Now, the fact of the Scriptures being silent as to any worship rendered to relics, or to be rendered to them, even in cases where miracles were wrought through their instrumentality, ought to be sufficient to satisfy any candid, unprejudiced inquirer that no such worship is due to them. But as Roman Catholics insist upon the fact of miracles having been performed by means of them in some instances, as if that afforded a sanction of the practices and teaching of their Church, we shall just take the point into consideration.

It is to be observed, then, that the Prophets and Apostles, as well as our Saviour Himself, when they wrought miracles, made use of sensible signs, sometimes the laying on of hands, sometimes words uttered at the time, frequently various other things, as, for instance, the hem of our Lord's garment, the shadow of Peter,

the rod of Moses, the mantle of Elias, the piece of wood that made the iron to swim, &c. Now, it was at once manifest that these things could not produce the miraculous results that followed. Consequently, men looked beyond them to a higher power that made use of such things, as mere instruments or signs of its operation; they immediately attributed the miraculous effect, not to the signs employed, but to the power exerted by the person who employed them. To take one instance—that of the woman with the issue of blood.<sup>1</sup> If our Lord had given that woman any medicine or food, or the like, and she then was healed, though it would still have been His power that would restore her, yet men might attribute the restoration to a healing property in the medicine, or whatever thing of that kind might be employed in effecting the cure. But when the cure was produced by touching the hem of his garment, men could not do this; they must perceive at once that there was no intrinsic power of healing in that garment or its hem, but that the power resided in the person to whom the garment belonged, and that it was Christ Himself that wrought the miracle. If, again, our Lord laid His hand upon any sick person, who thereupon became instantly well in health, it could not be said that Caiaphas the high priest, or any one else than Christ Himself, performed the cure. In this way the signs employed, whether they were words, or a touch, or any material thing, served to connect the agent with the miraculous effect produced. And this, so far as is made known to us, appears to be the reason why they were made use of. But we have no right to suppose that they were intended to be worshipped, or that it is justifiable to offer religious service or veneration to them. In almost all cases we know it must be preposterous to do so, or to think of doing so. A word or a touch was mostly made use of; but who ever thought of worshipping such things? We cannot conceive of such a thing. Now, all the other signs employed are to be placed in the same category, and the worshipping of them must be equally unjustifiable, unless, indeed, on the authority of Holy Scripture, such a difference or peculiarity be pointed out in certain cases as may warrant us in regarding them as exceptions. But we are not aware of this having ever been done, or even attempted. We ourselves can see no difference between the use that was made of the rod of Moses and the handkerchief of Paul and the word or touch of Christ in the miracles, in which they were respectively used as signs to connect the agent with the act performed. And we can see no more right, and, in fact, no more of sense, in worshipping one than another. As it would be absurd to worship or think of worshipping the undulations of the air produced by the organs of speech, it must be no less so to worship any material thing, such as an article of clothing, because it was used in the performance of a miracle; the fact of being so used applies as much in one instance as in the other, and as much entitles one to our veneration as the other. But as it will not authorize us in worshipping one, so neither the other. When our Lord put clay on the eyes of a blind man,<sup>2</sup> and bestowed sight upon him, would that blind man be acting right—would any one be acting right—in worshipping that clay? When the prophet restored the poisoned food by throwing meal into the pot,<sup>3</sup> was meal to be religiously venerated? Common sense says, no; and whatever some persons might do, the sons of the prophets, instead of falling down and adoring the miraculous meal, were somewhat wiser, for they eat it. It is not likely, however, that they reached that pitch of refinement to which some modern religionists have attained, viz., of eating what they worship. Such delicacy was hardly known in those rude times. But what think we of Naaman the Syrian? did he worship the Jordan, because that by washing in it seven times he was healed of his leprosy? We have some doubts as to Naaman having done it; but we strongly suspect that some "good Catholics" would conceive the river to be somewhat related to a holy well. Now, if a Romanist be justified in worshipping the bones of a dead saint, because that by means of them miraculous works may have been wrought, it will on the same grounds be justifiable to worship the river Jordan or the pool of Siloam. We are sure that no sensible Roman Catholic would think it right to become a river-worshipper; but if so, why become a bone-worshipper? We may see, then, very plainly that the mere fact of a thing having been used in the performance of a miracle does not entitle it to religious service or veneration.

But though Roman Catholics tell us of the bones of Eliseus and the handkerchiefs of Paul performing miracles, and urge this as an argument in behalf of the worship of their relics, they have never yet been able to show a single instance of a well authenticated miracle wrought by any of the multitudinous stores of decayed bones and ashes on which they bestowed their "due veneration." We say a well authenticated miracle; for though there are tales of miracles *ad nauseam*, together with weeping and bleeding statues and winking pictures, and the annual juggling of the blood of St. Januarius at Naples, still there never has been one which could bear the scrutiny of a strict inquiry; but, like the apparition of La Salette, they prove to be pious frauds, enacted to prop up a sinking supersti-

<sup>1</sup> Tractatus de Incarnatione. Appendix de cultu Sanctorum, Art. II. De Cultu SS. reliquiarum, p. 236. Dublin, 1812.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. xi., 22.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. xv., et seq.

<sup>4</sup> Josh. xxiv. 32.

<sup>5</sup> Rom. xv.

<sup>1</sup> Luke xli. 43, et seq.

<sup>2</sup> John vii.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Kings, iv.